



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.                           | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/721,503                                | 11/22/2000    | Yossi A. Hermush     | 1999P00975US01      | 3359             |
| 24737                                     | 7590          | 12/15/2011           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS |               |                      | KHONG, ALEXANDER    |                  |
| P.O. BOX 3001                             |               |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510                |               |                      | 2155                |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE                         | DELIVERY MODE |                      |                     |                  |
| 12/15/2011                                | ELECTRONIC    |                      |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com  
debbie.henn@philips.com  
marianne.fox@philips.com

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 09/721,503             | HERMUSH ET AL.      |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | ALEXANDER KHONG        | 2155                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-20,22,24-38,41-59,61 and 63-94 is/are pending in the application.
  - 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-20,22,24-38,41-59,61 and 63-94 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on 08 November 2011 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to communication filed on 08 November 2011, claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-15, 17, 22, 24-27, 29-38, 41-60, 62 and 63-93 have been amended; claims 21, 23, 39, 40 (previously presented as the second claim 39), 61 and 63 have been cancelled; and claim 94 has been added per the applicant's request. Accordingly, claims 1-20, 22, 24-38, 41-59, 61 and 63-94 are presently pending in the application.
2. The previous objection to the second claim 39 has been withdrawn in light of the Applicant's cancellation of the claim. The previous objection to claim 87 has been withdrawn in light of the Applicant's amendment to the claim.
3. The previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been withdrawn in light of the applicant's amendments to expressly incorporate hardware elements into the claims.
4. The replacement drawings were received on 08 November 2011. In light of the amended drawings, the previous objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.
5. The new Abstract was received on 01 November 2011 and is acceptable by the Examiner.

***Claim Objections***

6. Claims 34 and 41-93 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
In claim 34, the phrase "**wherein the hotspot report number of times**" should be changed to -- **wherein the hotspot report comprises number of times** --.

Claims 41-93 appear to be previously presented as claims 40-92; therefore, the numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Appropriate corrections are required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-20, 22, 24-38, 41-59, 61, 63-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092) hereinafter “Ferguson” in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,329 B1).

9. With respect to claim 1, Ferguson teaches **a method of providing hypervideo application user information, comprising:**

**tracking and recording media viewed by a user, wherein the media comprises hypervideo applications** (Ferguson: Col. 10, lines 29-39, and Col. 12, lines 15-23; disclosing the method (i.e. using Metering Tool) to track and record media viewed by users from using hypervideo (hypermedia) applications); **and**

**creating a user-configurable report, the report reflecting data regarding user access of the media** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 44-50; disclosing a user-configurable report (metering information) reflecting data regarding user access of the media).

Ferguson does not explicitly teach **wherein the creating act further comprises the acts of:**

**indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page; and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page.**

Smith, however teaches **indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing for each video-enhanced page (e.g., Web PAGE 2) information regarding previous video-enhanced pages from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page is indicated (i.e., indexed)); **and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing information regarding next video-enhanced pages (e.g., ITEM 1 - ITEM N) is indicated).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the user configuration report of Ferguson to include the page index as taught by Smith. The motivation would be to maintain a history of search (browsing) results in an easy-to-use, organized manner (Smith: Col. 2, lines 36-38).

The combination of Ferguson and Smith also teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises information regarding how viewing the current video-enhanced page was initiated, including one of user initiated and automatic activation, and paths the users took from the previous video-enhanced pages to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

10. As to claim 2, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the user-configurable report comprises a report including data after a user-defined start date** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

11. As to claim 3, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the user-configurable report comprises a report including data before a user-defined end date** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

12. As to claim 4, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report data comprises a number of times each media has been viewed** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

13. As to claim 5, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the media further comprises at least one of video, image, HTML or audio** (Ferguson: Col. 10, lines 29-31).

14. As to claim 6, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the user configures which of the media types are to be included in the report** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 62-64).

15. As to claim 7, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein each type of the media is identified in the report via representation with a unique icon** (Ferguson: Col. 38, lines 5-8).

16. As to claim 8, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the number of times each media has been viewed does not include returning to a media in a path in a same session** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

17. As to claim 9, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the number of media for which data is displayed in the report is selected by the user** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

18. As to claim 10, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises the number of user sessions during which the media was viewed** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

19. As to claim 11, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises the number of unique users to view a media** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

20. As to claim 12, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises the average time users spent viewing each media** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

21. As to claim 13, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report sorts media by the number of times each media has been viewed** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

22. As to claim 14, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the number of times each media has been viewed comprises both a total number of times a looping video has been viewed including views that result from looping, and a number of times the looping video has been viewed not as a result of looping** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 1-5).

23. As to claim 15, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises an indication of whether views of a particular media were user-initiated or automatic** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

24. As to claim 16, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises an indication of whether video media is looping media** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 1-5).

25. As to claim 17, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report further reflects a number of times each path has been taken through each hypervideo application** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

26. As to claim 18, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein indicating the number of times each path has been taken through each**

**hypervideo application comprises displaying data for a user-selected number of paths** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 24-29).

27. As to claim 19, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein indicating the number of times each path has been taken through each hypervideo application comprises indicating data for only those paths exceeding a user-defined minimum path length** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

28. As to claim 20, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein indicating the number of times each path has been taken through each hypervideo application comprises grouping paths together based on a user-defined number of same first pages in each path** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-29).

29. As to claim 22, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises data regarding the identity of the previous video-enhanced pages viewed before and linked to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 22-27).

30. As to claim 24, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises the average time users spent viewing the previous video-enhanced pages before proceeding to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

31. As to claim 25, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises the number of user sessions for each previous video-enhanced page from which users have**

**proceeded to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

32. As to claim 26, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises the percentage of total times when viewing the previous video-enhanced pages that users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

33. As to claim 27, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages comprises information about each hotspot on the current video-enhanced page and the next video-enhanced pages to which the hotspots are linked** (Ferguson: Col. 17, lines 37-39).

34. As to claim 28, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages comprises the media to which each hotspot is linked** (Ferguson: Col. 17, lines 50-51).

35. As to claim 29, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages further comprises an average time a user spends viewing the current video-enhanced page before progressing to each of the next video-enhanced pages** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

36. As to claim 30, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages further comprises a number of user sessions in which a person proceeds from the current video-**

**enhanced page to each of the next video-enhanced pages** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

37. As to claim 31, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the information regarding the next video- enhanced pages further comprises a percentage of total views of the current video- enhanced page that result in a user proceeding to each of the next video-enhanced pages** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

38. As to claim 32, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the user-configurable report further comprises a hotspot report** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

39. As to claim 33, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the hotspot report comprises number of sessions in which a user has selected each hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

40. As to claim 34, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **the hotspot report number of times each hotspot has been viewed by a user** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

41. As to claim 35, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the hotspot report comprises an average view time that users spent viewing the content linked to each hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

42. As to claim 36, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the hotspot report comprises the name and type of each hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 38, lines 5-8).

43. As to claim 37, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the hotspot report comprises a number of selections of each hotspot via a mouse** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

44. As to claim 38, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the hotspot report comprises percentage of viewers that clicked each hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

45. With respect to claim 41, Ferguson discloses **a non-transitory machine-readable medium with instructions stored thereon** (Figure 1; disclosing multiple servers with machine-readable medium), **the instructions when executed operable to cause a computer to provide hypervideo application user information by:**  
**tracking and recording media viewed by a user, where media comprises hypervideo applications** (Ferguson: Col. 10, lines 29-39, and Col. 12, lines 15-23; disclosing the method (i.e. using Metering tool) to track and record media viewed by users from using hypervideo (hypermedia) applications); **and**  
**creating a user-configurable report, the report reflecting data regarding user access of the media** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 44-50; disclosing a user-configurable report (metering information) reflecting data regarding user access of the media).

Ferguson does not explicitly teach **wherein the creating act further comprises the acts of:**

**indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a**

**current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page; and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page.**

Smith, however teaches **indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing for each video-enhanced page (e.g., Web PAGE 2) information regarding previous video-enhanced pages from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page is indicated (i.e., indexed)); **and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing information regarding next video-enhanced pages (e.g., ITEM 1 - ITEM N) is indicated).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the user configuration report of Ferguson to include the page index as taught by Smith. The motivation would be to maintain a history of search (browsing) results in an easy-to-use, organized manner (Smith: Col. 2, lines 36-38).

The combination of Ferguson and Smith also teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises information regarding how viewing the current video-enhanced page was initiated, including**

**one of user initiated and automatic activation, and paths the users took from the previous video-enhanced pages to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

46. As to claims 42-79, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 2-39, respectively. Claims 42-79 are similarly rejected.

47. As to claim 80, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **a method of providing hypervideo application user information, comprising the acts of:**

**tracking and recording media viewed by a user, where media comprises hypervideo applications** (Ferguson: Col. 10, lines 29-39, and Col. 12, lines 15-23; disclosing the method (i.e. using Metering tool) to track and record media viewed by users from using hypervideo (hypermedia) applications); **and**

**creating a user-configurable report** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 44-50), **the report reflecting data regarding user viewing of advertising media via hotspots** (Ferguson: Col. 4, lines 36-40; disclosing the support for advertising media via hotspots (Hyper document/Commerce subservice)).

Ferguson does not explicitly teach **wherein the creating act further comprises the acts of:**

**indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page; and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page.**

Smith, however teaches **indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing for each video-enhanced page (e.g., Web PAGE 2) information regarding previous video-enhanced pages from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page is indicated (i.e., indexed)); **and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing information regarding next video-enhanced pages (e.g., ITEM 1 - ITEM N) is indicated).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the user configuration report of Ferguson to include the page index as taught by Smith. The motivation would be to maintain a history of search (browsing) results in an easy-to-use, organized manner (Smith: Col. 2, lines 36-38).

The combination of Ferguson and Smith also teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises information regarding how viewing the current video-enhanced page was initiated, including one of user initiated and automatic activation, and paths the users took from the**

**previous video-enhanced pages to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

56. As to claim 81, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises the advertising media and an overlay image name** (Ferguson: Col. 13, lines 47-53).

57. As to claim 82, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises a click-through URL (Uniform Resource Locator) linked to each advertising media hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 13, lines 53-56; disclosing the click-through URL (hyperlinks) used to link to each advertising media hotspot).

48. As to claim 83, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises a number of times each advertising media was retrieved within a user session** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

49. As to claim 84, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises a number of times each advertising media was retrieved by a unique user** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

50. As to claim 85, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises a percentage of times that a user who viewed the advertising hotspot has selected the hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

51. As to claim 86, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **wherein the report comprises an average amount of time that users view each advertising media hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 65-Col. 38, line 8).

58. With respect to claim 87, Ferguson teaches **a non-transitory machine-readable medium** (Figure 1; disclosing multiple servers with machine-readable medium) **with instructions thereon, the instructions when executed operable to cause a computer to provide hypervideo application user information by:**

**tracking and recording media viewed by a user, where media comprises hypervideo applications** (Ferguson: Col. 10, lines 29-39, and Col. 12, lines 15-23; disclosing the method (Metering tool) to track and record media viewed by users from using hypervideo (hypermedia) applications); **and**

**creating a user-configurable report** (Ferguson: Col. 37, lines 44-50), **the report reflecting data regarding user viewing of advertising media via hotspots** (Ferguson: Col. 4, lines 36-40).

Ferguson does not explicitly teach **wherein the creating act further comprises the acts of:**

**indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page; and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page.**

Smith, however teaches **indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users**

**proceeded to the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing for each video-enhanced page (e.g., Web PAGE 2) information regarding previous video-enhanced pages from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page is indicated (i.e., indexed)); **and**

**indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page** (Smith: FIG. 6; disclosing information regarding next video-enhanced pages (e.g., ITEM 1 - ITEM N) is indicated).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the user configuration report of Ferguson to include the page index as taught by Smith. The motivation would be to maintain a history of search (browsing) results in an easy-to-use, organized manner (Smith: Col. 2, lines 36-38).

The combination of Ferguson and Smith also teaches **wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises information regarding how viewing the current video-enhanced page was initiated, including one of user initiated and automatic activation, and paths the users took from the previous video-enhanced pages to the current video-enhanced page** (Ferguson: Col. 36, lines 18-23).

52. As to claims 88-93, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 81-86, respectively. Claims 88-93 are similarly rejected.

53. As to claim 94, the combination of Ferguson and Smith teaches **the hotspot report comprising identification of an overlay used to represent the hotspot** (Ferguson: Col. 37, line 61-Col. 38, line 8).

***Response to Argument***

25. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEXANDER KHONG whose telephone number is (571)270-7127. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Khong/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2155

/Khanh B. Pham/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166